



Indiana Pro Bono Commission
One Indiana Square, Suite 530
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Indiana Bar Foundation
230 East Ohio Street, Suite 200
Indianapolis, IN 46204

COMBINED 2005 DISTRICT REPORT, 2007 PRO BONO GRANT APPLICATION, AND 2007 PLAN

Pro Bono District 6

Applicant: District Six Access to Justice, Inc.

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 324

City: New Castle, IN Zip: 47362

Phone: 765-521-6979 Fax: 765-529-9213

E-mail address: district6access@hotmail.com

Judicial Appointee: Honorable Mary G. Willis, Henry Circuit Court

Plan Administrator: Marianne J. Legge, J.D.

Names of Counties served: Grant, Madison, Delaware, Jay, Henry, Randolph, Blackford

**Percentage of volunteer attorneys (as defined on page 3) *who accepted a pro bono case in 2005* per registered attorneys in district, i.e. the district's pro bono participation rate 14.6%
To the extent the pro bono participation rate information is available by county, please provide below. (see attached page for breakdown by participating counties)**

Number of potential clients requesting help in 2005 (limit this to actual intake done or sessions in which plan administrator or his/her delegate provided more than minimal assistance): 1194 Clients Assisted. *(see attached page)

Amount of grant received for 2006: \$30,000

Amount of grant (2006 & prior years) projected to be unused as of 12/31/06: \$9,400.00

Amount requested for 2007: \$50,000

One supplemental, explanatory page may be added to the end of this report and plan.

- 1. Please write a brief summary of the 2007 grant request. Please include information regarding your district's planned activities including committee meetings, training, attorney recognition, newspaper or magazine articles, marketing and promotion. The grant request should cover needs to be addressed, methods, target audience, anticipated outcomes, and how past difficulties will be addressed.**

Committee Meetings:

District 6 Board has been very diligent about meeting regularly. The board meets about once every other month, and more if needed. The plan administrator meets with each of the counties with active programs as needed. The programs that use volunteers to handle intakes will continue to recruit new volunteers to assist with the programs. District 6 has maintained a good working relationship with Anderson University, Ball State Paralegal Program, Ivy Tech Paralegal program, and Indiana Wesleyan Pre-law program. We will continue to foster those relationships.

Activities:

For the year 2007, our district will continue to have Talk to a Lawyer Today program in the four counties we have historically had programs plus Randolph and Jay Counties. The TTAL day programs have been very successful in the past two years and continue to grow each year. We feel that this is an event that is successful for the attorneys as well as the people seeking services.

Grant County has been very consistent with providing CLE opportunities for the attorney's. It is anticipated that there will be CLEs in several of the Counties in 2007. Providing CLEs will allow our District to recruit more attorneys and provide incentives for attorney's that are already participating. The district will make attempts to partner with the bar associations to add a pro bono aspect to CLEs schedule.

District 6 will continue to recognize attorneys work within the district through articles in Indiana Lawyer/Res Gestae. District 6 will work to coordinate an attorney recognition event during the year 2007. This is not something that has been done in the past with District 6. We acknowledge the need to recognize attorneys that provide a great service to the indigent in our district. The plan administrator plans to work with the County Bar Associations to ascertain the feasibility of a recognition event for District 6 jointly or county specific events. We will utilize resources, such as Kelly Valentine with Indiana Bar Foundation to assist in planning.

District 6 will continue to make efforts to recruit attorneys to participate in our programs. This is an ongoing goal. We are going to create a welcome package for newly admitted attorneys in the counties to approach them about signing up for pro bono program participation sooner than later. Law schools have a pro bono requirement that students need to fulfill for graduation. The idea of doing pro bono work is not a "new" idea for them, and approaching the newly admitted attorneys would be a good way to improve our volunteer numbers.

2005 REPORT OF VOLUNTEER ATTORNEY CASES IN DISTRICT 6

Please attach additional pages for each pro bono provider that receives IOLTA funding, whether directly or indirectly, in your district. See the sample additional pro bono provider page 3A. Please list each attorney only once in the volunteer attorney column but complete one line for each pro bono case for that attorney.

Definitions

Case: A legal matter referred to and accepted by a pro bono attorney volunteer. This includes mediation and GAL services.

Volunteer Attorney: An attorney who has rendered pro bono service to at least one low-income client during the year or accepted a pro bono referral from the identified program. This does not include attorneys who are on the list of pro bono volunteers but who have never taken a case. The case numbers do not include cases screened, only cases actually referred to a pro bono attorney. This also includes an attorney who has worked solely on a pending pro bono case that was neither opened nor closed during the reporting year.

Case Type: Please use the abbreviations listed in Indiana Supreme Court Administrative Rule 8(B)(3) or any other defined abbreviation.

Name of Pro Bono Provider (includes legal service provider, court, plan administrator, bar association, and other organizations): **District Six Access to Justice, Inc.**

IOLTA funding accounts for 100 % of total pro bono provider budget. Please state the percentage of volunteers and cases which are attributable to IOLTA funding 100%. If this percentage is substantially more than the percentage of IOLTA funding, please explain.

Volunteer Attorney Name	County	# of new cases accepted opened in 2005	Number of cases closed in 2005	Number of cases pending in 2005 that were neither opened nor closed in 2005	Number of hours for cases closed in 2005 (column 4)	Case Type
Ardeth Wilson	Madison	1				ES
John Reeder	Madison	1	1		1.0	DR
Lisa Deley	Madison		1		2.5	DR
William Norton	Madison	1				DR
Eric Hall	Madison	1				DR
William Norton	Madison	1				DR
Michael Austin	Madison	1				GU
John Blevins	Madison	1				DR
Elizabeth Bybee	Madison	1				DR
Tim Lanane	Madison			1		EM
Mark Bennett	Madison			1		DR
Casey Cloyd	Delaware	1	1		6.5	MI

Bruce Munson	Delaware	1		1		GU
Kelly Bryan	Delaware	1		1		DR
B. Joseph Davis	Delaware	1		1		MI
Douglas Mawhorr	Delaware	1	1		20	DR
Sara Shade	Delaware	1	1		1.5	GU
Leslie Horn	Delaware	1	1		1.0	DR
Jennie Scott	Delaware	1		1		DR
Kimberly Dowling	Delaware	1	1		4.0	DR
Michael Painter	Delaware	1		1		DR
David Brock	Delaware	1	1		11.2	MI
Steven Murphy	Delaware	1	1		5	DR
Richard Hughes	Delaware	1		1		MI
Charles Retherford	Delaware	1	1		9	GU
Brian Pierce	Delaware	1		1		DR
Douglas Mawhorr	Delaware	1	1		5	DR
Bruce Munson	Delaware	1	1		3	MI
James Schafer	Delaware	1		1		DR
Alan Wilson	Delaware	1		1		DR
Jack Buckles	Delaware	1		1		Will
Brian Pierce	Delaware	1		1		DR
Sara Shade	Delaware	1	1			GU
Leslie Horn	Delaware	1	1		10	DR
Charles Clark	Delaware	1		1		DR
Linda Dague	Delaware	1	1		10.25	DR
Ken Shuck	Delaware	1		1		SS
B. Joseph Davis	Delaware	1		1		MI
Douglas Mawhorr	Delaware	1		1		DR
Leslie Horn	Delaware	1		1		DR
James Schafer	Delaware	1	1		2	DR
Chip Alexander	Delaware	1	1		10	GU
Steven Murphy	Delaware	1		1		DR
Leslie Horn	Delaware		1		35	DR
Dianna Bennington	Delaware		1		16	DR

Ross Rowland	Delaware		1		43	DR
Leslie Horn	Delaware		1		25	DR
Chip Alexander	Delaware		1		4	GU
Dianna Bennington	Delaware		1		6	LT
Richard Hughes	Delaware		1		2	TX
Steven Murphy	Delaware		1		5	DR
Beau White	Grant	1				DR
Teri Pollett	Grant	1				DR
Happi Johnston	Grant	1				DR
Beau White	Grant	1	1		3.5	DR
Joseph Certain	Grant	1	1		1.5	Rest
Happi Johnston	Grant		1		4.83	DR
Don Leslie	Grant	1				BK- lim
Don Leslie	Grant	1				MI
Tia Brewer	Grant	1				DR
Happi Johnston	Grant	1				DR
Stephen Wolfe	Grant	1				GU
Stephen Wolfe	Grant	1				DR
Tia Brewer	Grant	1				DR
David Scott	Henry	1	1		4	DR
Greg Crider	Henry	1				GU
David McCord	Henry		1		6	Coll.
Jim Millikan	Henry		1		9.5	DR
Gerald Hodson	Henry	1	1		4	Prop.
Scott Hayes	Henry		1		45.5	CP
David McCord	Henry	1	1		7	DR
Jim Millikan	Henry	1	1		10	DR
David Jordan	Henry	1	1		4.5	JP
Joe Bergacs	Henry	1	1		1	DR
Greg Crider	Henry	1				GU
David McCord	Henry	1				Hd. Lic
David Scott	Henry	1				DR
Mary Phillips	Henry	1				DR
Mary Phillips	Henry	1				DR
Ed Dunsmore	Henry	1				DR
Ed Dunsmore	Henry	1				DR
Bill Baker	Henry	1				GU
David McCord	Henry			1		DR
TOTAL: 83		TOTAL: 67	TOTAL: 37	TOTAL: 20	TOTAL: 339.28	

2005 REPORT OF VOLUNTEER ATTORNEY LIMITED INFORMATION ACTIVITY IN DISTRICT 6

This limited legal information chart can include activities such as pro se clinics and call-in or walk-in informational services.

Please attach additional pages for each pro bono provider that receives IOLTA funding, whether directly or indirectly, in your district. See the sample additional pro bono provider page 4A.

Please list each attorney only once in the volunteer attorney column but complete one line for each type of legal information activity for that attorney.

Name of Pro Bono Provider (includes legal service provider, court, plan administrator, bar association, and other organizations): **District Six Access to Justice, Inc.**

Volunteer Attorney Name	County	Type of Activity	Number of Hours
Robert Wisehart	Henry	Talk to a Lawyer Today	2
William Baker	Henry	Talk to a Lawyer Today	2
James Millikan	Henry	Talk to a Lawyer Today	2
Michael Mahoney	Henry	Talk to a Lawyer Today	2
David Copenhaver	Henry	Talk to a Lawyer Today	2
Rick Hall	Madison	Talk to a Lawyer Today	2
Ardeth Wilson	Madison	Talk to a Lawyer Today	2
Rodney Cummings	Madison	Talk to a Lawyer Today	2
John Ritchison	Madison	Talk to a Lawyer Today	2
Gerald Shine	Madison	Talk to a Lawyer Today	2
Angela Simms	Madison	Talk to a Lawyer Today	2
Leslie Horn	Delaware	Talk to a Lawyer Today	2.5
Sara Shade	Delaware	Talk to a Lawyer Today	2.5
Ralph Dowling	Delaware	Talk to a Lawyer Today	2.5
Douglas Mawhorr	Delaware	Talk to a Lawyer Today	2.5
Franklyn Brinkman	Delaware	Talk to a Lawyer Today	2.5
Dana Kenworthy	Grant	Talk to a Lawyer Today	5
Brian McLane	Grant	Talk to a Lawyer Today	5
Debbie Burke	Grant	Talk to a Lawyer Today	2
Warren Haas	Grant	Talk to a Lawyer Today	2
Stephen Wolfe	Grant	Talk to a Lawyer Today	2
Morris Kelsay	Grant	Talk to a Lawyer Today	2
OVERALL VOLUNTEER ATTORNEY TOTAL:	22	OVERALL HOURS TOTAL:	52.5

2005 REPORT

Please list your District's 2005 activities--including committee meetings, training, attorney recognition, newspaper or magazine articles, marketing and promotion--in chronological order.

<u>Date</u>	<u>Activity</u>
1/6/05	Henry County Pro Bono Intake
1/8/05	Advertisement For TTAL in Courier Times (Henry County)
1/10/05	Meeting Grant County, Delaware County, Indy
1/11/05	Board Meeting
1/15/05	Article in Anderson Paper for TTAL
1/15/05	Advertisement for TTAL in Courier Times
1/16/05	Article in Anderson paper for Talk to a Lawyer Today.
1/16/05	Radio Announcement in Grant County
1/17/05	Talk to a Lawyer Today, Grant, Delaware, Madison, & Henry Counties
1/20/05	Henry County Pro Bono Intake
2/3/05	Henry County Pro Bono Intake
2/10/05	Henry County Pro Bono Intake
2/25/05	Meeting with Delaware County Pro Bono Board
3/1/05	Board Meeting
3/3/05	Henry County Pro Bono Intake
3/3/05	Meeting with Grant County Pro Bono Board
3/17/05	Henry County Pro Bono Intake
3/18/05	Meeting with Delaware County Pro Bono Board
3/24/05	Meeting with Grant County Pro Bono Board
4/1/05	Pro Bono Intake/Mediation Training Grant County
4/7/05	Meeting with Grant County Pro Bono Board
4/7/05	Henry County Pro Bono Intake
4/13/05	Legal Assistance for Victims (LAV) meeting in Indianapolis (ICADV/ICJI)
4/15/05	Meeting with Delaware County Pro Bono Board.
4/21/05	Henry County Pro Bono Intake
4/29/05	Grant County Pro Bono Intake
May 2005	Article due for Pro Bono Insert Indiana Lawyer
5/3/06	Board meeting
5/5/06	Henry County Pro Bono Intake
5/6/05	Grant County Pro Bono Intake
5/11/05	American Inns of Court/CLE District 6 presentation
5/19/06	Henry County Pro Bono Intake
5/24/05	Presentation at Henry County Kiwanis
5/27/05	Grant County Pro Bono Intake
6/1/05	LAV meeting
6/2/05	Henry County Pro Bono Intake
6/3/05	Grant County Pro Bono Intake
6/14/05	Board Meeting
6/16/05	Meeting with Grant County Pro Bono Board
6/16/05	Henry County Pro Bono Intake
6/24/05	Grant County Pro Bono Intake
7/1/05	Grant County Pro Bono Intake
7/6/05	CLE Henry County DOXPOP, Admin Rule 9 and Pro Bono
7/7/05	Henry County Pro Bono Intake

7/14/05	Meeting with Madison County Pro Bono/United Way
7/29/05	Grant County Pro Bono Intake
8/4/05	Henry County Pro Bono Intake
8/5/05	Grant County Pro Bono Intake
8/18/05	Henry County Pro Bono Intake
8/23/05	Board Meeting
8/25/05	LAV Meeting
8/26/05	Grant County Pro Bono Intake
8/31/05	LAV Meeting
9/1/05	Henry County Pro Bono Intake
9/2/05	Grant County Pro Bono Intake
9/6/05	Meeting with Madison County United Way
9/13/05	LAV Meeting
9/20/05	Meeting in Madison County
9/22/05	ISBA meeting presentation of District 6 activities
9/22/05	Henry County Pro Bono Intake
9/27/05	LAV meeting
9/29/05	Grant County Pro Bono Intake
10/4/05	LAV meeting
10/6/05	Henry County Pro Bono Intake
10/7/05	Grant County Pro Bono Intake
10/11/05	LAV meeting
10/20/05	Henry County Pro Bono Intake
10/21/05	Plan Administrator's Retreat & Shepard Dinner, Dick Hughes the recipient
10/28/05	Grant County Pro Bono Intake
11/1/05	Board Meeting
11/3/05	Henry County Pro Bono Intake
11/4/05	Grant County Pro Bono Intake
11/17/05	Henry County Pro Bono Intake
11/22/05	LAV meeting
11/30/05	LAV meeting
12/1/05	Henry County Pro Bono Intake
12/2/05	Grant County Pro Bono Intake
12/2/05	LAV meeting Grant County & Grant County Pro Bono Board Mtg.
12/12/05	LAV meeting
12/14/05	LAV meeting Anderson
12/15/05	LAV meeting Muncie
12/15/05	Henry County Pro Bono Intake

2005 REPORT

Please provide a short summary of how the provision of pro bono service is coordinated in your district, including the intake process, the relationships of pro bono providers in the district, how referrals are made, and how reporting is done.

- **Henry County:** Intakes are done twice monthly in a face to face intake with the Plan Administrator. ILSI has intake once a month at the Interlocal Community Action Program Office. Reporting of closed cases are recorded online at the Pro Bono Commission's Website by the Plan Administrator. There has not historically been collaborations with ILSI, that is something that we will work towards in 2006-07
- **Grant County:** In the Spring of 2005 we partnered with Indiana Wesleyan University & Ivy Tech to have paralegal/pre-law students handle intakes at the Grant County Courthouse twice monthly. Once the intakes are complete, the Plan Administrator handles making referrals whether to an attorney, or other service agency. Intakes commenced in late April. Intakes are held in the Jury Rooms on the third floor of the Grant County Courthouse. The Plan administrator reports hours completed on the website when a case is closed. The Information about the pro bono program is posted around the building as to the times and the dates. ILSI also conducts intakes at the Senior Center monthly. We work with ILSI to send intakes to the Fort Wayne office that may be appropriate for services with ISLI. We have not had the Fort Wayne office take a case from Grant County. ILSI has a senior law project that provides intakes monthly at the local senior center. Grant County is also trying to set up a mediation program to be utilized in family law cases. The Pro Board is very active in Grant County and meets monthly.
- **Delaware County:** There were several meetings to try to interest Ball State/Ivy Tech Students to handle intakes. Dick Hughes was responsible primarily for handling calls and making the referrals. The goal was to move the intake site to a central location and have a dedicated phone line, efforts were made to approach the Delaware County Bar Association. The pro bono board did not meet as regularly because of the elections. The hours are not reported online when cases are closed. That is something that will change in the coming years.
- **Madison County:** Calls are received on Thursday mornings from 8 to 10a.m. Referrals are made by the plan administrator after screening occurs. There was an attempt to partner with United Way to possibly obtain funding for an administrative person to be locally based with students from Anderson University doing intakes. Rick Hall approached the Court Administrator and the Judges and was able to procure two spaces for the students to handle intakes. In late 2005 referrals were being sent back to the plan administrator that raised concerns about attorney participation. Once cases are closed, the plan administrator reports hours online.
- **Blackford, Jay, & Randolph:** These three counties while large in size have very small attorney populations. We do have attorney's that sit on our board from Jay and Randolph Counties, and we are trying to get services to those counties, but may not be traditional "pro bono" programs such as making sure that there are Pro Se Packets accessible. Both Jay and Randolph counties are interested in hosting Talk to a Lawyer Today program.
- **Relationships with other Service Providers:** There is a positive working relationship with Indiana Legal Services of Indiana. We have John Boyce, sitting on our board from the Indianapolis office. With the closing of the Madison County office, our District is split between the Fort Wayne and Indianapolis offices. We try to work together with these offices only referring matters that are specialized in those particular offices in order to avoid duplication of services.

- **Legal Assistance for Victims Grant:** In the spring of 2005 there was a relationship developed with INCJI, Pro Bono Commission, Indiana Coalition Against Domestic Violence, and other Domestic Violence/Sexual Assault agencies throughout the state to attempt to apply for funding that would allow attorneys to provide legal assistance to victims of domestic violence and sexual assault. The actual grant application was not due until early 2006. However, the networking opportunities that were formed allowed the Pro Bono districts and the DV/Sexual Assault agencies to come together. The relationships developed enabled District 6 to get a better understanding of the needs that exist for victims of domestic violence.

Please describe any special circumstances, including difficulties encountered, affecting your District's 2005 implementation of its plan.

Attorney recruitment is a problem in some of the counties and is a consistent struggle for the District. The attorneys that volunteer are far from meeting the needs of the applicants. The main area we have a need is in family law and more specifically custody issues. Our district has a finite amount of attorneys that are willing to accept these cases. Madison County is the largest Bar in the district, but we do not have attorneys consistently accepting cases. The loss of the ILSI office in January 2005 and the closing of ContactHELP in late 2004 created a huge setback for the County. The need for legal services is known in the community and United Way is interested in associating with us to provide funding for an administrative person and local intake coordination. However, toward the end of 2005 referrals were being made to attorneys that had previously agreed to volunteer and they were not accepting cases or stating that they were not a part of the program.

Progress with programs has been slow but it is moving forward.

BUDGETS for 2005, 2006 and 2007

Income Category	2005 Actual Income	2005 Budget	2006 Actual Income To Date	2006 Budget	2007 Budget
A. INCOME	<u>22,043.13</u>		<u>9,764.37</u>	-	-
1. IOLTA Grant Amount	10,000.00	10,000.00	30,000.00	30,000.00	50,000.00
Other Income: <i>Explain source(s) and if Actual/Expected in narrative</i>					
2. American Inns of Court			1813.92 Laptop purchase		
3. Interest					
4.					
5. Total Income (sum of lines A1 – A4)	32,043.13	10,000	41,578.29	30,000	50,000
Expense Category	2005 Actual Expenditures	2005 Budget	2006 Actual Expenditures To Date 6/9/06	2006 Budget	2007 Budget
B. PERSONNEL EXPENDITURES					
1. Plan Administrator	18,838.82	22,000.00	6089.77	22,500	30,000.00
2. Paralegals					
3. Others - Please explain		3,000.00	2084.16		
4. Employee benefits		3,600.00			
a. Insurance	1,113.00		1137.00	3000.00	5,000.00
b. Retirement plans					
c. Other - Please explain					
5. Total Personnel expenditures (sum of lines B1 - B4c)	19951.32	28,600.00	9310.00	25,500.00	35,000.00
C. NON-PERSONNEL EXPENDITURES					
1. Occupancy					
2. Equipment Rental					
3. Office Supplies	80.94	150.00	1948.88	300.00	500.00
4. Telephone	454.43	360.00	153.94	1000.00	2,000.00
5. Travel	1,081.84	1,100.00	500.94	2000.00	2,500.00
6. Training		1,500.00		225.00	500.00
7. Library					
8. Malpractice Insurance		2,000.00			2000.00
9. Dues and Fees	49.00	250.00	50.00	250.00	500.00
10. Contingent Reserve		2,000.00			1,000.00
11. Litigation Reserve					4,000.00
12. Marketing and promotion	145.50	1000.00			500.00
13. Attorney recognition					500.00
14. Litigation expenditures					
15. Property Acquisition					
16. Contract Services	484.60		183.18	500.00	1,000.00

17. Grants to other pro bono providers					
18. Other - Please explain	114.03	150.00	1813.92	225.00	
19. Total Non-Personnel Expenditures (sum of lines C1 - C18)	2410.34	8,510.00	1023.02	4,500.00	15,000.00
D. TOTAL EXPENDITURES (sum of B5 & C19)	22,362.16	37,110.00	10333.02	30,000.00	50,000.00
E. ENDING FUND BALANCE (A5 less D)		9794.37	31,245.27		

Budget Narrative

Please provide descriptions of the following line items in the foregoing budget chart, by item number, in the space provided. Please explain any other budget entries that are not self-explanatory, including other sources of income.

Lines (A)(1), (2), (3), (4) Please indicate the number of hours per week for each personnel position, rate of pay, and all employee benefits.

The plan administrator works about 17 hours weekly. The other staff are volunteers only from local universities in the counties. Benefits include workers compensation insurance.

The American Inns of Court donated up to \$2000.00 in 2006 for the purchase of laptop/computer programs to be used by District 6. ILSI is going to work with District 6 in order to assist setting up computer database software to keep track of statistics.

Line (B) (1) Please describe the occupancy cost in terms of square footage, utilities or other amenities and indicate whether the occupancy cost is above or below the market rate for that space.

Office space is in-kind. The plan administrator is also employed as the family court administrator and the office space provided by the county is also used for Pro Bono. The telephone is an expense; it is also included with the County expenses so we are able to take advantage of the discounts on long distance.

- Line C3: Computer purchase included in this line item (2006)
- Line C5: Mileage
- Line C8: Malpractice Insurance. As an incentive to the participating attorney's to have we would like to have that set up and going for 2007.
- Line C11: Litigation Reserve. We would like to have some money available to assist payment of extraordinary expenses such as depositions, publication costs, etc. These expenses would be provided pending board approval.
- Line C16: Contract Services: We use a local (Henry County) Accounting firm to manage our money. They charge below their usual and customary rate.
- Line C18: Covers postage, for 2007 will be put under office supplies.

ANNUAL TIMETABLE FOR SUBMISSION OF FORMS AND CHECKS:

January 1:	Checks distributed
July 1:	Annual report, plan and grant application due to IPBC
November:	Notification of awards
December 1:	IBF grant agreement due and revised budget due

PRO BONO DISTRICT NUMBER <u>6</u> LETTER OF REPRESENTATION

The following representations, made to the best of our knowledge and belief, are being provided to the Indiana Pro Bono Commission and Indiana Bar Foundation in anticipation of their review and evaluation of our funding request and our commitment and value to our Pro Bono District.

Operation under Rule 6.6

In submitting this application for funding, this district is representing itself as having a Pro Bono Plan, which is pursuant to **Rule 6.6** of the Indiana Rules of Professional Conduct. The plan enables attorneys in our district to discharge their professional responsibilities to provide civil legal pro bono services; improves the overall delivery of civil legal services to persons of limited means by facilitating the integration and coordination of services provided by pro bono organizations and other legal assistance organizations in our district; and ensures access to high quality and timely pro bono civil legal services for persons of limited means by (1) fostering the development of new civil legal pro bono programs where needed and (2) supporting and improving the quality of existing civil legal pro bono programs. The plan also fosters the growth of a public service culture within the district which values civil legal pro bono publico service and promotes the ongoing development of financial and other resources for civil legal pro bono organizations.

We have adhered to **Rule 6.6** (f) by having a district pro bono committee composed of:

- A. the judge designated by the Supreme Court to preside;
- B. to the extent feasible, one or more representatives from each voluntary bar association in the district, one representative from each pro bono and legal assistance provider in the district, and one representative from each law school in the district; and
- C. at least two (2) community-at-large representatives, one of whom shall be a present or past recipient of pro bono publico legal services.

We have determined the governance of our district pro bono committee as well as the terms of service of our members. Replacement and succession members are appointed by the judge designated by the Supreme Court.

Pursuant to **Rule 6.6** (g) to ensure an active and effective district pro bono program, we:

- A. prepare in written form, on an annual basis, a district pro bono plan, including any county sub-plans if appropriate, after evaluating the needs of the district and making a determination of presently available pro bono services;
- B. select and employ a plan administrator to provide the necessary coordination and administrative support for the district pro bono committee;
- C. implement the district pro bono plan and monitor its results; and
- D. submit an annual report to the Commission.

Commitment to Pro Bono Program Excellence

We also understand that ultimately the measure of success for a civil legal services program, whether a staffed or volunteer attorney program, is the outcomes achieved for clients, and the relationship of these outcomes to clients' most critical legal needs. We agree to strive for the following hallmarks which are characteristics enhancing a pro bono program's ability to succeed in providing effective services addressing clients' critical needs.

1. Participation by the local bar associations and attorneys. The associations and attorneys believe the program is necessary and beneficial.

2. Centrality of client needs. The mission of the program is to provide high quality free civil legal services to low-income persons through volunteer attorneys. Client needs drive the program, balanced by the nature and quantity of resources available.

3. Program priorities. The program engages in a priority-setting process, which determines what types of problems the program will address. Resources are allocated to matters of greatest impact on the client and are susceptible to civil legal resolution. The program calls on civil legal providers and other programs serving low-income people to assist in this process.

4. Direct representation component. The core of the program is direct representation in which volunteer attorneys engage in advocacy on behalf of low-income persons. Adjunct programs such as advice clinics, pro se clinics and paralegal assistance are dictated by client needs and support the core program.

5. Coordination with state and local civil legal providers and bar associations. The programs work cooperatively with the local civil legal providers. The partnerships between the civil legal providers and the local bar association results in a variety of benefits including sharing of expertise, coordination of services, and creative solutions to problems faced by the client community.

6. Accountability. The program has mechanisms for evaluating the quality of service it provides. It expects and obtains reporting from participating attorneys concerning the progress/outcome of referred cases. It has the capability to demonstrate compliance with requirements imposed by its funding source(s), and it has a grievance procedure for the internal resolution of disputes between attorneys and clients.

7. Continuity. The program has a form of governance, which ensures the program will survive changes in bar leadership, and has operational guidelines, which enable the program to survive a change in staff.

8. Cost-effectiveness. The program maximizes the level of high quality civil legal services it provides in relationship to the total amount of funding received.

9. Minimization of barriers. The program addresses in a deliberate manner linguistic, sensory, physical and cultural barriers to clients' ability to receive services from the program. The program does not create undue administrative barriers to client access.

10. Understanding of ethical considerations. The program operates in a way which is consistent with the Rules of Professional Conduct; client confidentiality is assured and conflicts of interest are avoided. The staff and volunteers are respectful of clients and sensitive to their needs.

11. ABA Standards. The program is designed to be as consistent with the ABA Standards for Programs Providing Civil Pro Bono Legal Services to Persons of Limited Means as possible.

No events, shortages or irregularities have occurred and no facts have been discovered which would make the financial statements provided to you materially inaccurate or misleading. To our

knowledge there is nothing reflecting unfavorably upon the honesty or integrity of members of our organization. We have accounted for all known or anticipated operating revenue and expense in preparing our funding request.

We agree to provide human-interest stories promoting Pro Bono activities in a timely manner upon request of the Indiana Bar Foundation or Indiana Pro Bono Commission. We further agree to make ourselves available to meet with the Pro Bono Commission and/or the Indiana Bar Foundation to answer any questions or provide any material requested which serves as verification/source documentation for the submitted information.

Explanation of items stricken from the above Letter of Representation:

It is understood that this Letter does not replace the Grant Agreement or other documents required by the Indiana Bar Foundation or Indiana Pro Bono Commission.

Signatures:

Judicial Appointee Signature

Date

Plan Administrator Signature

Date

Supplemental Page for Plan Administrator's Report

The breakdown for referrals by county is as follows:

- Madison County: **5%**
 - *158 Total attorneys in County, 8 referrals 32 participating attorneys*
- Delaware County: **29.4%**
 - *136 Total attorneys in County, 40 referrals 30 participating attorneys*
- Grant County: **15.5%**
 - *77 Total attorneys in County, 12 referrals 14 participating attorneys*
- Henry County: **39.4%**
 - *38 Total attorneys in County, 15 referrals 18 participating attorneys*

Randolph, Jay, and Blackford do not have programs.

The attorney's that are signed up to participate select the area of law in which they will accept referrals, so there are many attorneys that are not getting referrals because of the area of law they selected to take cases, there is not as great of need.

*The total number of clients served does not include the calls that are received in Delaware County. It was not something that was historically tracked. It is estimated that there were at least two calls for service a day and that would a total of 520 calls. This is an area that will be tracked more in 2006/2007.